SITE: VIENNEST I MAP BREAK: 1.9 OTHER: WI.1

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY



REGION 4

61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104

December 26, 2001

4WD-SSMB

Jennifer Kaduck, Chief
Hazardous Waste Management Branch
Georgia Environmental Protection Division
205 Jesse Hill Drive
Floyd Tower East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

SUBJ: Vienna Street Dump Site Reassessment Report

Fort Valley, Georgia

EPA ID No. GA**0**000048934

Dear Ms. Kaduck:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Final Reassessment Report for the Vienna Street Dump Site. The results of the Site Reassessment, dated December 17, 2001, indicate that a designation of No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP) is warranted for this site under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The site is hereby referred to your office for any further action deemed necessary by the State. A copy of the CERCLA Final Decision Form is also attached for your convenience.

Please accept our sincere gratitude for all of the help provided to EPA by Mr. Jim Sliwinski and Mr. Bob Pierce, of your staff, during this effort. If you have any questions about this report, please contact me at (404) 562-8913, or Mario Villamarzo at (404) 562-8912.

Sincerely,

Carolyn B. Thompson

Georgia Site Assessment Manager South Site Management Branch

cc: Jim Ussery, EPD Jim Sliwinski, EPD



REMEDIAL SITE ASSESSMENT DECISION - EPA REGION IV

Page 1 of 1

Date: 12/17/2001

County or Parish: PEACH State: GA Fer to Report Dated: 12/17/2001 Report Type: SITE REASSESSMENT 001 Port Developed by: START	<i>F</i> •	IENNA STREET DUMP SITE	State ID:
Profession Dated: 12/17/2001 Report Type: SITE REASSESSMENT 001 Profession Developed by: START ECISION: 1. Further Remedial Site Assessment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not required because: 1. Further Remedial Site Assessment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not required because: 1. Tal. Site does not qualify for further remedial site assessment under CERCLA (No Further Remedial Action Planned - NFRAP) 1. The site may qualify for action, but is deferred to: 2. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 2. Priority: Higher Lower 2. Down Cher: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned) SCUSSION/RATIONALE: ditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of neem to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. 1. Further Remedial Site Assessment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not required because in the site assessment under CERCLA (No Further Remedial Action Planned) 2. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 2. Priority: Higher Lower 2. Soil samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of neem to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. 3. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 4. Priority: Higher Lower 5. Custom Assessment Vertical Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE: 4. Between Lower Assessment Vertical Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE: 5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.	Site Names:	County or Parish: PEACH	State: GA
ECISION: 1. Further Remedial Site Assessment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not required because: 1. Site does not qualify for further remedial site assessment under CERCLA (No Further Remedial Action Planned - NFRAP) 1. Site may qualify for action, but is deferred to: 2. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 2a. Priority: Higher Lower 2b. Other: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned SCUSSIONRATIONALE: ditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of neem to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.			
I. Further Remedial Site Assessment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not required because: X 1a. Site does not qualify for further remedial site assessment under CERCLA (No Further Remedial Action Planned - NFRAP) 1b. Site may qualify for action, but is deferred to: 2. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 2a. Priority: Higher Lower 2b. Other: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE:	<u>'</u>	nopole types	
(No Further Remedial Action Planned - NFRAP) 1b. Site may qualify for action, but is deferred to: 2. Further Assessment Needed Under CERCLA: 2a. Priority: Higher Lower 2b. Other: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE: Iditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of incern to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. In the failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.	because:		
2a. Priority: Higher Lower 2b. Other: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE: Iditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of incern to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.	(No Further Remedial Action I	Planned - NFRAP)	-A
2a. Priority: Higher Lower 2b. Other: (recommended action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned SCUSSION/RATIONALE: ditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of neern to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.] 1b. Site may qualify for action	n, but is deferred to:	
SCUSSION/RATIONALE: ditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of neern to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.	2a. Priority: Higher	Lower	ed
ditional groundwater samples were taken on-site. Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and adjacent to the site, which were of nearn to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.		ction) NEMAP (No Futher nemedial Action Flatin	ed
ncern to local residents. Soil samples were also taken in the playground area of the adjacent apartment complex. e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pathway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Based on the low number of drinking water gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.		Soil samples were taken along footpaths through the site and	d adjacent to the site, which were of
gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration pathway is not a viable pathway.			
	e failed to score above 28.5. The groundwater pat gets that obtain water from the surficial aquifer and	thway was the primary reason for re-evaluating the site. Base of the confined Tuscaloosa aquifer, the groundwater migration	ed on the low number of drinking water pathway is not a viable pathway.
	ter		
		·	
	,		
		•	
	•	• .	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			-
	•		,
	•		
	,		

EPA Form # 9100-3

Site Decision Made by: CARQLYN THOMPSON